

Here's What's Next on the Globalist Calendar



by James Corbett

corbettreport.com

April 17, 2022

As you should know by now, the threat facing free humanity is not a secret conspiracy but a [perfectly open one](#). Those seeking to monopolize the resources of the planet and institute a system of perfect technocratic control are, generally speaking, not secretive about their plans. On the contrary. Any number of publicly available records—from [books](#) and [white papers](#) to [blog posts](#), [fora](#) and [lectures](#)—give an interested public plenty of lead time to prepare for the next steps in the unfolding globalist agenda.

So, in the grand Corbett Report tradition of [Listening to the Enemy](#), let's employ one of the simplest methods for understanding what's coming next in the global plan: let's consult the would-be world controllers' own calendar.

JUNE 2022: Stockholm+50



As post-graduate students of The University of Corbett, you will already know about

the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1972 . . . but in case you need a refresher, you might want to consult [How & Why Big Oil Conquered the World](#), where you can learn all about that Stockholm summit.

In addition to being Maurice Strong's *entrée* into the exciting (and lucrative) world of [Big Oil environmentalism](#), the conference also laid the groundwork for the UN-fronted corporate takeover of the world's resources under the pretense of "saving Mother Earth." It served a triple function for the globalists: it launched the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), it provided a template for the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio, and it hosted the first talking shop for what would become Agenda 21 and, eventually, Agenda 2030.

Well, guess what? It's baaaaack.

That's right, our good, planet-loving overlords at the United Nations are back to the scene of the crime to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stockholm conference with a new summit in the Swedish capital, this one with the characteristically uninspired name "Stockholm+50: a healthy planet for the prosperity of all – our responsibility, our opportunity."

Lest you think "Stockholm+50" is simply going to be an excuse for the global jet set to pat themselves on the back with a couple of forgettable political speeches or the unveiling of a new plaque, you should know that a great deal of planning has gone into this:

- The UN General Assembly has passed not [one](#) but [two](#) resolutions on the establishment of the conference and its agenda;
- A [dedicated website for the conference](#) has been created to keep up with the latest developments;
- A "blog by jurists for diplomats" entitled [Pathway to the 2022 Declaration](#) has been launched to influence the conversation surrounding the "Political Declaration" (capital letters and all) that "**will be adopted**" at the conference (emphasis theirs);
- And yet *another* website has been set up to host the "[Declaration for Stockholm+50](#)," which may or may not be the "Political Declaration" referenced above and which has been endorsed by a gaggle of globalist NGOs.

In addition to all of this, Stockholm will also host "[World Environment Day 2022](#)" on June 5th, 2022, the anniversary of the creation of UNEP.

So what is all this hype about, exactly? Oh, just the usual globalist claptrap. By "the

usual globalist claptrap" I mean the takeover of the planet and its resources by the predator class, of course. But don't take my word for that. From the aforementioned [Declaration for Stockholm+50](#):

On October 8, 2021, the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) recognized the "right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment." For this right to be implemented, structural changes to the legal, economic, social, political, and technological spheres will be required to restore a stable and well-functioning Earth System. A shared consciousness of our global interdependence must give rise to a new common logic, to define and recognize the global commons that support life on Earth — the planetary system that connects us all and on which we all depend. This is a foundational step toward the establishment of a governance system to effectively manage human interactions with the Earth System.

Yes, exactly as one would expect, the "save the planet" slogan is being used as a rallying cry for . . .

(. . . wait for it . . .)

. . . the strengthening of global government! Wow, who would have seen that one coming?

Specifically, after vague and wooly rhetoric about "implementing the right to a healthy environment" and "establishing a regenerative economy," the declaration ends by imploring the good folks at the United Nations to give themselves more power! Yaaaay!

The long-term governance of the global commons, the delivery of global public goods, and management of global public risks all require a permanent system of effective governance to reliably manage our interactions with the Earth System as a whole. For example, a proposal to repurpose the inactive United Nations Trusteeship Council has been widely discussed, including most recently in the UN Secretary-General's *Our Common Agenda* (OCA) report.

Something tells me that in the [history-by-the-winners](#) textbook of the future, June 5th, 2022, will be hailed as the day that the brave and benevolent bureaucrats of the UN saved the planet by bestowing their gracious global government on us. (" . . . and the people of the earth commemorate this momentous event in a prayer of thanks to their UN leaders before the intake of their daily ration of bugs and rainwater.")

But wait! What does it say on the declaration's "[About](#)" page?

This Conference should be used as an “ideas laboratory” to develop innovative solutions for the commons, economy, and governance, which will become the seeds of action at the **2023 Summit of the Future**, as foreseen in the UN Secretary General’s *Our Common Agenda* report.

A 2023 Summit of the Future? Oh yes. Which brings us to the next date on our globalist calendar . . .

September 2023: Summit of the Future



Last September, UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres launched an 85-page report entitled "[Our Common Agenda](#)." According to a [write-up from Democracy International](#), the report offers a "roadmap for upgrading the UN" and "calls for reinvigorated multilateralism, renewed solidarity and stronger consideration of future generations."

Exactly as you would expect, the report's Summary begins by reminding us of the (globalist-concocted) "existential crises" that (the globalists constantly warn us) are threatening humanity's existence, such as COVID-19, geopolitical conflict and (of course) climate change. Naturally, this immediately turns into a demand that the peoples of the world:

- "re-embrace global solidarity," which evidently entails "a global vaccination plan to deliver vaccines against COVID-19 into the arms of the millions of people who are still denied this basic lifesaving measure";
- "renew the social contract between Governments and their people and within societies," which evidently entails "updated governance arrangements to deliver better public goods and usher in a new era of universal social protection, health coverage, education, skills, decent work and housing, as well as universal access to the Internet by 2030 as a basic human right";
- "end the 'infodemic' plaguing our world by defending a common, empirically backed consensus around facts, science and knowledge," which evidently entails adopting "a global code of conduct that promotes integrity in public

information";

... and a host of other globalist imperatives, from the creation of a new UN-led "Emergency Platform" that will be "triggered automatically in crises of sufficient scale and magnitude, regardless of the type or nature of the crisis involved," to the adoption of a new UN-led "Global Digital Compact" for "promoting a trustworthy Internet by introducing accountability criteria for discrimination and misleading content."

In other words, the usual globalist claptrap.

But embedded in this pean to global government is another idea: the convening of a **"Summit of the Future"** in conjunction with the meeting of the UN General Assembly in New York in September 2023. Picking up on the current Klaus Schwabian [globalese](#) in vogue among the [not-so-Superclass](#) these days, Guterres writes that "it will be important to hold a high-level, multi-stakeholder 'Summit of the Future' to advance ideas for governance arrangements in the areas of international concern mentioned in this report, and potentially others, where governance arrangements are nascent or require updating."

If you've been keeping up with the MSM lately, you might have noticed that this "Summit of the Future" idea has gained traction with the globalist supergophers, including recently deceased ex-Secretary of State Madeline ["The Price Was Worth It"](#) Albright, who penned [an editorial](#) last October calling "Our Common Agenda" a "pathbreaking new report" and calling on UN member states to "endorse a follow-on 'modalities resolution' supporting Guterres's call for a Summit of the Future in September 2023." In order to put teeth into this globalist chinwag, Albright argued that "preparatory committees (PrepComs) should be convened around the world" prior to the summit "to consider and advance global governance innovations in peace, security and humanitarian action; sustainable development and COVID-19 recovery; human rights, inclusive governance, and the rule of law; and climate governance."

But it isn't just the Pax Americana old guard who are excited about the prospects of reshaping the world order. As veteran Corbett Reporters will know, the Chinese overlords, too, are [all in on this agenda](#) and excited for the possibility of consolidating their control over their own population and moving to a more important seat at the [globalist technocratic table](#). Accordingly, ChiCom propaganda organ *China Daily* released [a report](#) in January dutifully parroting Guterres' assessment of the "five-alarm fire" that the world is facing from COVID-19, inequality, the climate crisis, mistrust of government and online misinformation. This was followed last month by a [Xinhua report](#) that hails "the establishment of a high-level advisory board on effective multilateralism" and notes that the Summit of

the Future will "advance ideas for governance arrangements in certain areas that could be considered global public goods or global commons, including climate and sustainable development beyond 2030, the international financial architecture, peace, outer space, the digital space, major risks, and the interests of future generations."

The accolades for Guterres' brilliant report (which he totally wrote all by himself, guys, honest!) and his brilliant idea for a summit (which he is single-handedly organizing all on his lonesome) continue to pour in. The Qatari and Swedish UN ambassadors co-wrote an op ed in Al Jazeera hailing the idea as a chance to "[move toward a UN 2.0](#)," and the World Future Council (yes, there is such a thing) has generously [pledged the support](#) of their "50 international change-makers" to prepare the summit.

As the World Future Council notes: "a Summit for the Future will be essential towards accelerating the implementation of the SDGs and ensuring that the talks and discussions finally turn into actions on the ground to truly leave no one behind."

MAY 2024: WHO Global Pandemic Treaty



Speaking of bad news for free humanity, you've probably heard me talking about the upcoming WHO global pandemic treaty by now. But don't worry if you *haven't* heard me talk about it, because you certainly *will* hear me talk about it more in the future.

In case you haven't heard of it yet, the next big push in global biopolitics is the call for a global pandemic treaty to further abrogate national sovereignty and to hand more power to the WHO to dictate global health policy in the name of stopping the next scamdemic. As I've stressed several times now, just as 9/11 was merely the public unveiling of the new "war on terror" governance paradigm, the COVID

scamdemic was merely the public unveiling of the new "biosecurity" governance paradigm. It is this proposed global pandemic treaty that will start to hardwire that new governance paradigm into place, much like the PATRIOT Act began to hardwire the terror paradigm in place in the US.

The campaign pushing the formation of this treaty relies on an obvious Problem - Reaction - Solution narrative to nudge the public into accepting the next steps in the biosecurity agenda.

- **Problem:** The WHO "failed" miserably in stopping the COVID "pandemic" from "ravaging the world."
- **Reaction:** We need a global health organization with teeth!
- **Solution:** A global pandemic treaty must be signed to hand more power to the WHO.

Once you realize that *all* proposals for giving more power to a small clique of unaccountable bureaucrats is introduced in this way—"you never want a serious crisis go to waste" as Rahm Emmanuel [infamously observed](#)—the manipulation becomes obvious. An "independent panel" set up to "review" the "problem" of the WHO's "failed" response to the scamdemic delivered a report in January that—to the surprise of absolutely no one—[concluded](#) that "the WHO's ability to enforce its advice, or enter countries to investigate the source of disease outbreaks, is severely curtailed" and thus new rules need to be set up at the global level to give the WHO more power to police the world for health threats. They even called it the WHO's "Chernobyl moment," implying that it should use this "disaster" as a chance to implement fundamental reforms.

This supposedly "independent" report provides perfect cover for the globalists to [conclude a new pandemic treaty](#) that will either [expand, reform, revise or override](#) the existing [International Health Regulations](#), the 2005 treaty which itself gave the WHO [unprecedented power](#) to declare a "Public Health Emergency of International Concern" and to intervene in the affairs of sovereign nations in the name of combating perceived health threats.

Details of precisely what such a treaty will involve—or even what form it will take—are still maddeningly vague. The proposed new treaty would be, in UN jargon, an "instrument," of which there are three types: recommendations, conventions and regulations. Regulations (like the International Health Regulations of 2005) are automatically legally binding for all 194 WHO member states unless they explicitly object. Measures that could be contained in such a treaty may include "the sharing of data and genome sequences of emerging viruses and rules on equitable vaccine distribution" and a "One Health approach" that "connects the health of humans,

animals and the planet."

In other words, the usual globalist claptrap.

One hardly needs to be a conspiracy realist to understand how such mushy-sounding goodness and gumdrops from the WHO could be used to implement a very dark biosecurity agenda. Whatever the specifics, you can bet your bottom dollar that all of the worst aspects of biomedical tyranny—from new regulations to rush experimental medical interventions through human trials in the event of a declared emergency to the standardization of vaccine passports—will be topics of discussion when the negotiations on the treaty begin in earnest.

Don't worry, though, you can still let your voice be heard! The WHO has even opened up a [special page on their website](#) to allow public comment on the potential treaty!

. . . Of course, they're not interested in hearing whether or not people actually want such a treaty in the first place, only what the *hoi polloi* feel should be *included* in such a treaty. Specifically, they're asking:

"What substantive elements do you think should be included in a new international instrument on pandemic preparedness and response?"

And even then, they're not looking to hear from *everyone*. In fact, they have an entire page laying out the [terms and conditions](#) by which you can submit a comment in the first place, including stipulations that those wishing to comment "Refrain from making any statements unrelated to the topic at hand," that they present their comments "in a respectful manner, free of any profanity, ad hominem attacks, vulgarity, or other inappropriate language" and that they "declare the entity [they] represent and any other affiliations, engagement, or roles relevant to the public hearings or to WHO, in light of its mandate." Oh, and please keep in mind "that WHO is not able to ensure that all interested parties will be able to participate in the public hearings, and that thus WHO does not make any commitment or undertaking to allow you to participate in the public hearings."

But other than that, they *totally* want to hear from you.

. . . Oh, wait. Scratch that. The deadline for the public to submit their comments has already passed. I guess we're too late. Hmmm, perhaps we should have consulted the globalist calendar sooner.

*This weekly editorial is part of **The Corbett Report Subscriber** newsletter.*

To support The Corbett Report and to access the full newsletter, please [sign up](#) to